Strategies to Projects: Building a Common Understanding
2003 LE/SRFB Workshop Evaluation Summary

Nineteen evaluations were completed and turned in.

1. To what extent did the workshop achieve the following stated outcomes?

A policy recommendation to the SRFB to consider during the summer of 2003 based upon the agreements reached by participants at the workshop.

Fully Achieved	31%
Somewhat Achieved	56%
Did not Achieved	13%

Please explain your ratings:
- ➢ Issues for policy considerations appear to be variable across the landscape.
- ➢ The recommendations were not specific, but I don't know that they need to be.
- ➢ Feedback was given, but I don't believe agreement was reached.
- ➢ Generally agreed to further consider items discussed through the P.A.C.
- ➢ What will the P.A.C. do? Hope recommendations will be acted on.
- ➢ Didn't provide suggestions on how to solve problem re: strategy interpretation by Tech Panel.

A greater understanding of how LE strategies fit into regional recovery plans.

Fully Achieved	29%
Somewhat Achieved	65%
Did not Achieved	6%

Please explain your ratings:
- ➢ What is presently done is seen as valuable and will be incorporated.
- ➢ Variability on how LE strategies fit regional plans—may be just fine.
- ➢ Generalities were explained; on the ground specifics still need to be heard.
- ➢ Gained much better understanding of LE strategies—appear to be different (less) from habitat chapters for recovery plans.
- ➢ Our strategy is wider than what is needed for SRFB.

Feedback to the P.A.C. about ways to improve the project evaluation process.

Fully Achieved	50%
Somewhat Achieved	50%
Did not Achieved	0%

Please explain your ratings:
- ➢ Need to resolve how to avoid "dueling" tech ratings.
- ➢ Recognized that SRFB tech panel role needs to be clarified.
- ➢ If post-it note feedback is addressed, process will be improved.
- ➢ Feedback from LE's was direct and based on their experience.

2. **To what extent will the information and discussions help you improve your efforts?**

Will be a great help   68%
Will help somewhat   32%
Will not help   0%

Please explain your ratings:
➢ Heard concise issues and corresponding guidance; will take messages back and try to come to agreement on strategies and processes.
➢ Strategy focus revision will produce a document acceptable to the T. P. and reduce different rating outcomes.
➢ Sharpened our perception of what a strategy should be.
➢ Guidance on specifics relating to strategy structure is incredibly important and was helpful.
➢ Workshop outlined next steps for our LE re: strategy revision; don't know how we will implement.
➢ Learned about the confluence of social and T. P. ratings and strategy and how LE strategy rolls up into salmon recovery plan.

3. **What are you willing and able to do to help improve the SRFB evaluation process? (Percentages indicate the number of checks indicating a yes)**

95%   Revise my strategy according to the guidelines and principles discussed.
95%   Respond to requests for information from the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC).
58%   Participate in a task force at the request from the PAC (if any are needed).

4. **What questions or ideas do you still have about LE strategies or the SRFB evaluation process that was not addressed in the workshop and not identified for the PAC or SRFB to consider?**

➢ Involve T. P. in helping LE's with strategy revision.
➢ What assurance can be made to citizens groups that funding will be provided if strategies are revised according to guidelines given in workshop?
➢ What projects does the SRFB support on a year-to-year basis? When will that information be made available to LE's?
➢ How will T. P. deal with projects of high community value but low biological value?
➢ How does the IAC SRFB staff come up with recommendations?
➢ More info on SRFB evaluation of projects.
➢ Need resources to fill large data gaps.

5. **Comments/Recommendations for workshop--general**
➢ More graphical presentation of the overall structure
➢ Provide more detailed agenda
➢ Orientation to all issues (primer)
➢ Chronology of process (from law)
➢ Develop user guide for TP to follow during training; revise based on new knowledge.
➢ This workshop is a good example of what is working.